



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,088	03/27/2001	Kirt A. Debique	MSI-790US	2532

22801 7590 07/02/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

LE, MIRANDA

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2003

2177

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/820,088	DEBIQUE ET AL.
	Examiner Miranda Le	Art Unit 2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 March 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5. 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: a semi-column (;) should be changed to a period (.). Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless:

(e) the invention was described in

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-5, 8-26, 34-36, 38-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Katz et al. (US Patent No. 6,356,971 B1).

Katz anticipated independent claims 1, 9, 17, 19, 21, 34, 38, by the following:

As per claim 1, Katz teaches “maintaining meta data associated with a plurality of pieces of content stored on a plurality of pieces of media” at col. 10, lines 5-21; “maintaining meta data associated with another plurality of pieces of content, wherein each of the other plurality of pieces of content corresponds to one of the plurality of pieces of

content and is another version of the data in the corresponding one of the plurality of pieces of content” at col. 10, lines 31-39, col. 9, lines 28-60;

“altering the meta data associated with one of the other plurality of pieces of content in response to the meta data associated with the corresponding one of the plurality of pieces of content being altered” at col. 4, line 42 to col. 5, line 7, col. 10, lines 31-39.

As per claim 9, Katz teaches “receiving an identification of a change to be made to meta data corresponding to a particular piece of content on a particular piece of media” at col. 10, lines 5-38;

“changing, based on the identification, meta data corresponding to the particular piece of content” at col. 5, lines 31-38;

“identifying one or more other pieces of content associated with the particular piece of content” at col. 10, lines 22-38;

“changing, based on the identification, meta data corresponding to the one or more other pieces of content” at col. 10, lines 46-57.

As per claim 17, Katz teaches “a disc drive configured to have a removable disc inserted therein, wherein the removable disc includes a plurality of pieces of content” at col. 4, line 8 to col. 5, line 7;

“a local storage device configured to store another plurality of pieces of content, wherein each of the other plurality of pieces of content corresponds to one of the plurality of pieces of

content and is another version of the data in the corresponding one of the plurality of pieces of content” at col. 4, line 31 to col. 5, line 33;

“a meta data management module, configured to alter meta data associated with one of the other plurality of pieces of content in response to meta data associated with the corresponding one of the plurality of pieces of content being altered” at col. 4, line 22 to col. 5, line 7, col. 10, lines 31-39.

As per claim 19, Katz teaches “receiving an identification of a plurality of tracks on a disc” at col. 9, lines 2-14;

“obtaining table of contents information from the disc” at col. 9, lines 14-44; “generating a disc identifier based at least in part on the table of contents information” at col. 9, lines 28-43;

“accessing a local meta data store to identify meta data corresponding to the tracks and associated with another disc” at col. 9, lines 28-47;

“generating a new storage structure, corresponding to the disc, and including the identified meta data” at col. 9, line 49 to col. 10, line 21.

As per claim 21, Katz teaches “receiving a notification of a new piece of media, wherein the new piece of media includes a plurality of pieces of content that are selected by a user for inclusion on the new piece of media, and wherein the user selection is based on one or more other pieces of content associated with one or more other pieces of media” at col. 9, lines 28-43;

“generating a media identifier corresponding to the new piece of media” at col. 9, lines 28-60;

“identifying, from a meta data store, meta data corresponding to the plurality of pieces of content and associated with the one or more other pieces of content” at col. 9, lines 28-47; “saving, as meta data corresponding to the new piece of media, the identified meta data” at col. 10, lines 5-39.

As per claim 34, Katz teaches “a set of entries identifying objects” at col. 9, lines 54-60; “another set of entries identifying relationships between selected ones of the objects identified in the set with selected others of the objects” at col. 9, lines 43-47; “an additional set of entries identifying meta data associated with individual objects” at col. 9, lines 49-65.

As per claim 38, Katz teaches “receiving an indication of a change to be made to meta data corresponding to a content track associated with a particular medium” at col. 10, lines 5-38, col. 9, lines 2-65; “identifying a file associated with the content track, wherein the file stores a different version of the data in the content track” at col. 5, lines 31-38, col. 9, lines 44-48; “changing, based on the indication, meta data corresponding to the content track” at col. 10, lines 22-38; “changing, based on the indication, meta data corresponding to the file” at col. 10, lines 46-57.

As per claim 2, Katz teaches “each of the plurality of pieces of content is a track of a compact disc (CD)” at col. 9, lines 28-60.

As per claim 3, Katz teaches “each of the other plurality of pieces of content is a ripped version of the corresponding one of the plurality of pieces of content” at col. 10, lines 22-57.

As per claim 4, Katz teaches “each of the other plurality of pieces of content is stored on a local hard drive” at col. 5, lines 11-33, col. 9, lines 14-22, Fig. 1.

As per claim 5, Katz teaches “receiving an identification of a set of content selected from the plurality of pieces of content” at col. 5, lines 11-16;

“obtaining table of contents information from a disc on which all of the sets of content is stored” at col. 5, lines 16-33;

“generating a disc identifier based at least in part on the table of contents information” at col. 5, lines 33-49;

“identifying meta data corresponding to the set of content” at col. 6, lines 1-22;

“generating a new storage structure, corresponding to the disc, and including the identified meta data” at col. 10, lines 32-38.

As per claim 8, Katz teaches “a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 1” at col. 11, lines 11-67, Fig. 1.

As per claim 10, Katz teaches “the particular piece of content on the particular piece of media comprises a particular song on a particular compact disc (CD)” at col. 10, lines 5-57.

As per claim 11, Katz teaches “the identification includes new meta data and wherein changing the meta data corresponding to the particular piece of content comprises overwriting

any previous meta data corresponding to the particular piece of content with the new s meta data” at col. 9, lines 28-43, col. 5, lines 33-50.

As per claim 12, Katz teaches “the particular piece of content comprises an audio track and wherein the other pieces of content comprise different versions of the audio track” at col. 9, lines 28-43.

As per claim 13, Katz teaches “the other pieces of content comprise ripped versions of the particular piece of content” at col. 9, lines 11-27, col. 10, lines 22-57.

As per claim 14, Katz teaches “original meta data associated with the particular piece of content comprises meta data received from a remote server, and wherein the change to be made to the meta is data corresponding to the particular piece of content comprises new meta data received from a user” at col. 9, lines 28-43.

As per claim 15, Katz teaches “a receiving another identification of a change to be made to meta data, wherein the other identification is a change to be made to one of the other pieces of content” at col. 9, lines 28-43;

“changing, based on the other identification, the meta data corresponding to the one of the other pieces of content” at col. 9, lines 28-60;

“changing, based on the identification, the meta data corresponding to the to particular piece of content” at col. 10, lines 31-39;

“changing, based on the other identification, the meta data corresponding to the others of the one or more other pieces of content” at col. 4, line 43 to col. 5, line 7.

As per claim 16, Katz teaches “maintaining an indication of a source of the change to the meta data corresponding to the particular piece of content” at col. 10, lines 5-21; “maintaining an indication of a source of the change to the meta data corresponding to each of the one or more other pieces of content” at col. 10, lines 31-67; “receiving an identification of another change to be made to meta data corresponding to the particular piece of content” at col. 4, line 42 to col. 5, line 7, col. 10, lines 31-39; “checking whether the source of the change to the meta data corresponding to the particular piece of content was a user” at col. 9, lines 28-47; “changing, based on the identification of the other change, meta data corresponding to the particular piece of content if the source of the change to the meta data corresponding to the particular piece of content was the user” at col. 9, lines 28-47; “checking whether the source of the change to the meta data corresponding to the one or more other pieces of contents was the user” at col. 9, lines 28-47; “changing, based on the identification of the other change, meta data corresponding to the one or more other pieces of content if the source of the change to the meta data corresponding to the one or more other pieces of contents was the user” at col. 9, lines 49-54.

As per claim 18, Katz teaches “the local storage device is further configured to store both meta data associated with the plurality of pieces of content and meta data associated with the other plurality of pieces of content” at col. 11, lines 11-67.

As per claim 20, Katz teaches “the plurality of instructions further cause the one or more processors to save an indication of a relationship between the plurality of tracks on the disc and corresponding to tracks associated with the other disc” at col. 9, lines 27-54.

As per claim 22, Katz teaches “the new piece of media comprises a compact disc (CD)” at col. 10, lines 5-39.

As per claim 23, Katz teaches “each of the plurality of pieces of content comprises a song” at col. 10, lines 5-39.

As per claim 24, Katz teaches “obtaining table of contents information for the new piece of media” at col. 9, lines 2-14;

“calculating, based at least in part on the table of contents information, the media identifier corresponding to the new piece of media” at col. 9, lines 14-27.

As per claim 25, Katz teaches “saving an indication of a relationship between content on the new piece of media and the corresponding one or more other pieces of media” at col. 10, lines 5-21, col. 10, lines 31-39.

As per claim 26, Katz teaches “One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 21” at col. 9, lines 2-60.

As per claim 35, Katz teaches “each set of entries is implemented as a different table in a database” at col. 4, line 31 to col. 5, line 7, Fig. 2.

As per claim 36, Katz teaches “the set of entries also associates the objects with identifiers” at col. 9, lines 49-65.

As per claim 39, Katz teaches “the content track “comprises an audio track” at col. 8, line 66 to col. 9, line 27.

As per claim 40, Katz teaches “the content track comprises an audio/video track” see Abstract.

As per claim 41, Katz teaches “the content track comprises a video track” see Abstract.

As per claim 42, Katz teaches “the particular medium s comprises a particular compact disc (CD)” see Abstract.

As per claim 43, Katz teaches “the particular medium comprises a particular digital versatile disc (DVD)” see Abstract.

As per claim 44, Katz teaches “the particular medium comprises a particular optical disc” see Abstract.

As per claim 45, Katz teaches “One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim is 38” at col. 4, lines 8-42, col. 5, lines 1-7.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 6-7, 27-33, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Katz et al. (US Patent No. 6,356,971 B1), in view of Bergman et al. (US Patent No. 6,564,263 B1).

As per claim 27, Katz teaches “maintaining a set of disc identifiers” at col. 9, lines 54-60; “for each disc identifier, maintaining a set of corresponding children objects, wherein each of the children objects corresponds to a track on the disc associated to with the disc identifier” at col. 9, lines 9, lines 43-67;

Katz does not explicitly teach the following limitations, however, Bergman teaches “for each of one or more of the individual children objects, maintaining a set of additional

objects, wherein each additional object corresponds to a file associated with the track corresponding to the child object" at col. 6, line 43 to col. 7, lines 62;

"associating, for each of the one or more individual children objects, the set of additional objects with the child object" at col. 6, line 43 to col. 7, lines 62.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Katz with the teachings of Bergman to include "for each of one or more of the individual children objects, maintaining a set of additional objects, wherein each additional object corresponds to a file associated with the track corresponding to the child object, and associating the set of additional objects with the child object" in order to provide a multimedia content description system for describing both streams and aggregations of multimedia objects.

As per claim 6, Katz teaches "maintaining a set of disc identifiers" at col. 9, lines 54-60; "for each disc identifier, maintaining a set of children objects, wherein each of the children objects corresponds to one of the plurality of pieces of content" at col. 9, lines 43-47.

Katz does not specifically teach "for each of one or more of the individual children objects, maintaining a set of additional objects, wherein each additional object corresponds to one of the other plurality of pieces of content". However, Bergman teaches this limitation at col. 6, lines 43 to col. 7, line 62.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Katz with the teachings of Bergman to include "for each of one or more of the individual children objects, maintaining a set of additional objects, wherein each additional object corresponds to one of the other plurality of pieces of content" in order to

provide a multimedia content description system for describing both streams and aggregations of multimedia objects.

As per claim 7, Katz teaches “a set of entries identifying objects, where each of the plurality of pieces of content corresponds to an object” at col. 9, lines 44-48; “another set of entries identifying relationships between selected ones of the objects identified in the set with selected others of the objects” at col. 9, lines 49-65; Katz does not explicitly teach “an additional set of entries identifying meta data associated with individual objects”. However, Bergman teaches this limitation at col. 6, line 43 to col. 7, line 62.

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Katz with the teachings of Bergman to include “an additional set of entries identifying meta data associated with individual objects” in order to provide a multimedia content description system for describing both streams and aggregations of multimedia objects.

As per claim 28, Bergman teaches “associating meta data with each child object and each additional object” at col. 6, lines 43-67.

As per claim 29, Bergman teaches “propagating, to the set of additional objects, any changes made to meta data corresponding to the child object” at col. 6, lines 43-67.

As per claim 30, Katz teaches “receiving an indication to change meta data associated with one track on the disc” at col. 10, lines 5-38;

“altering, in response to the indication, meta data associated with the child object corresponding to the one track” at col. 4, line 27 to col. 5, line 7, col. 10, lines 31-39; “altering, in response to the indication, meta data associated with the additional object corresponding to the child object corresponding to the track” at col. 10, lines 31-39.

As per claim 31, Katz teaches “one or more disc identifiers in the set of disc identifiers is a compact disc (CD) identifier” at col. 9, lines 28-43.

As per claim 32, Katz teaches “one or more disc identifiers in the set of disc identifiers is a digital versatile disc (DVD) identifier” at col. 4, lines 8-31.

As per claim 33, Katz teaches “One or more computer-readable memories containing a computer program that is executable by a processor to perform the method recited in claim 27” at col. 4, line 8 to col. 5, line 7, Figs. 1, 2.

As per claim 37, Bergman teaches “the other set of entries identifies the relationships based on the identifiers associated with the objects” at col. 6, line 43 to col. 7, line 62.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Miranda Le whose telephone number is (703) 305-3203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax number to this Art Unit is (703) 746-7238. The TC 2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

ml

Miranda Le
June 24, 2003



GRETA ROBINSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER